

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4-21 remain pending in the application, with claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 being the independent claims.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 1-2 and 4-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0143529 (hereinafter referred to as "Schmid") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,708,885 (hereinafter referred to as "Beutnagel") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,983,239 (hereinafter referred to as "Epstein"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection since Schmid, Beutnagel and Epstein, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each element of independent claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 and their respective dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 19-21 for at least the following reason.

Independent claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 include a similar feature of: wherein the generic and non-generic words that are part of a particular application are assigned a higher confidence level than the generic and non-generic words that are not part of the particular application. In support of the rejection as applied to this claimed feature, the Examiner added Epstein (col. 11, lines 7-31). Epstein discusses assigning probability values to rules within a particular CFG and then returning only substrings corresponding to rules having a probability value greater than a threshold probability value (see, e.g., col. 11, lines 7-11). Assigning probability values to rules and then comparing the probability values to a threshold

probability value is very different from the claimed feature. Applicants assert that Epstein does not discuss or suggest assigning a higher confidence value based on whether the generic and non-generic words are part of the particular application, as claimed. Applicants reviewed Epstein in its entirety and believe that Epstein does not teach or suggest this claimed feature. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Schmid, Beutnagel and Epstein, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest every feature of the claimed invention. For at least this reason, independent claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 and their respective dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 19-21 are distinguishable from Schmid, Beutnagel and Epstein, either taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW**

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-3311 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

**Appln. Serial No. 09/752,994  
Attorney's Docket No. 42390P10364  
Reply to non-final Office Action mailed on March 31, 2006**

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Thus, Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,  
Intel Corporation

Dated: June 20, 2006

/Molly A. McCall/Reg. No. 46,126  
Molly A. McCall  
(703) 633-3311

P10364 response to third non-final OA

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	
On: <u>6/20/2006</u>	
Signature: 	<u>6/20/2006</u> Date